



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,571	12/19/2000	Kathryn L. Parker	MS #155647.1/40062.88-US-	5903
7590	05/17/2006		EXAMINER	
Homer L. Knearl Merchant & Gould P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903			PATEL, HAresh N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/741,571	PARKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 6-18, 26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 6-18, 26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 6-18, 26 and 27 are subject to examination. Claims 1-5 are cancelled.

Claims 19-25 are withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/3/2006, pages 7-20, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 6-18, 26 and 27 is maintained. (Note: claims 19-25 are withdrawn, please see election/restriction section of the office action dated 10/20/2005).

Applicant argues (1), "The amendments to the claims 6, 9 and 18 are made only for clarification purpose only".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The claims contain additional limitations for example usage of notification profiles, usage of predetermined notification mode as claimed etc. (please see claims 1 and 6) that were not presented in the previously presented claims. Hence, contrary to the applicant's assertions the scope of the claims is indeed altered. In fact, the scope of the claims has been narrower compared to previously presented claims.

Applicant argues (2), "Because the claims 19-25 are directed to the same invention as the claimed in claims 6-18 the restriction is improper".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Contrary to applicant's assertions the claimed invention of the claims 19-25 and the claimed invention of the claims 6-18 are distinct from each other. Please refer to the office action dated 10/20/2005 for the restriction. For example, the claims of applicant

selection invention, i.e., claims 6-18 do not include selection of a profile based on the user's present environment, modifications of associations based on the user's environment, to provide different notification types based on a user's environment, different types of notifications depending on the environment of the user, alter the type of alert notification, high volume ring, a flashing light, depending on the environment of the user, such as when the user is in a meeting", etc. as asserted by the applicant. This one of the several reasons why the claims 19-25 are directed to the distinct invention compared to the invention of the claimed subject matter of claims 6-18. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (3), "the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the features of independent claims i.e., usage of notification profiles, predetermined notification mode.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, "usage of notification profiles, predetermined notification mode", has been newly added, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (4), "cited reference, i.e., Treyz et al., 6,587,835 (Hereinafter Treyz) does not disclose or teach or suggest the claimed limitations, i.e., storing two or more profiles of notification events for a user in the memory of the small computer device, associating notification events with different notification types, a memory unit storing a plurality of profiles for a user, the profile relating notification events with notification types, selection of a profile based on the user's present environment, modifications of associations based on the user's environment, to provide different

notification types based on a user's environment, different types of notifications depending on the environment of the user, alter the type of alert notification, high volume ring, a flashing light, depending on the environment of the user, such as when the user is in a meeting". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "storing two or more profiles of notification events for a user in the memory of the small computer device, associating notification events with different notification types, a memory unit storing a plurality of profiles for a user, the profile relating notification events with notification types, selection of a profile based on the user's present environment, modifications of associations based on the user's environment, to provide different notification types based on a user's environment, different types of notifications depending on the environment of the user, alter the type of alert notification, high volume ring, a flashing light, depending on the environment of the user, such as when the user is in a meeting", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See *In re Wilder*, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). What is claimed is, "storing two or more profiles of notification events for a user wherein the notification events are associated with at least one notification type". Treyz discloses the claimed limitations, storing two or more profiles (e.g., each message type (fig. 69) denotes different profiles that a user can adjust to receive notification of events, i.e., proximity, local, notifications, etc, col., 35, line 53 –

col., 36, line 10, col., 44, lines 20-65), of notification events for a user (e.g., multiple accounts of a user is supported by handheld computing device, col., 26, lines 29-33) in the memory of the small computer device wherein the notification events are associated with at least one notification type (e.g., multiple users may be supported by handheld computing device, col., 26, lines 29-33, hence, each user may access a different shopping list and set different notification settings. As disclosed in figure 69 each user after loggin (each of his/her accounts) on selects and applies a particular notification mode in order to receive a notification of an event. Each message type (fig. 69) denotes different profiles that a user can adjust to receive notification of events, i.e., proximity, local, notifications, etc, col., 35, line 53 – col., 36, line 10, col., 44, lines 20-65). Also, page 19, lines 16 – 21, clearly states, “Although the invention has been described in language specific to structural features and/or methodological steps, it is to be understood that the invention defined in the appended claims is not necessarily limited to the specific features or steps described. Rather, the specific features and steps are disclosed as preferred forms of implementing the claimed invention. Since many embodiments of the invention can be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention, the invention resides in the claims hereinafter appended”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (5), “the combined teachings of cited references, i.e., Treyz and Wies do not disclose or teach or suggest the claimed limitations, i.e., assignment of a particular sound file to a particular event”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Treyz teaches the concept of accessing the settings that

are stored in the profile, for example, to assign/select a tone for a notification event (e.g., figure 69, col., 35, line 53 – col., 36, line 10, col., 44, lines 20-65). Wies discloses assignment of a particular sound file to a particular event (e.g., col., 7, lines 2-3, col., 32, line 48 – col., 33, line 3). With the combined teachings of Treyz and Wies a sound file would be utilized to provide an audio alert assigned to an event. A profile containing information related to a user including sound file selection help the user to select different sound files for different events. The selection of a sound file for an event help store the sound file for a user. Also, page 19, lines 16 – 21, clearly states, “Although the invention has been described in language specific to structural features and/or methodological steps, it is to be understood that the invention defined in the appended claims is not necessarily limited to the specific features or steps described. Rather, the specific features and steps are disclosed as preferred forms of implementing the claimed invention. Since many embodiments of the invention can be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention, the invention resides in the claims hereinafter appended”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (6), “Zimmers et al., 6,816,878 (Hereinafter Zimmers) and Shetty et al., 5,808,907 (Hereinafter Shetty) are Non-analogous Art as there is no suggestion to combine these references”. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As per the claimed invention, the invention only accomplishes a computer process / system for notifying a user of notification events. Treyz teaches the applicant's claimed invention a computer program product readable by a computer and encoding instructions for

executing a computer process for notifying a user of notification events (e.g., a handheld computing device notifications, figure 69), computer system for notifying a user of notification events (e.g., a handheld computing device notifications, figure 69). Zimmers and Shetty also disclose the limitations regarding the applicant's concerned notification and events, which is the same field of endeavor. Further, In response to applicant's argument that Zimmers and Shetty is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See 2141.01 (a). It is well established that a conclusion of obviousness may be made based on a combination of references based on a reason, suggestion or motivation to lead an inventor to combine those references. *In re Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastic Inc.*, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1629 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Also, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of a primary reference. It is also not that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinarily skill in the art. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 414, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981); *In re Young*, 927 F.2d 588, 591, 18 USPQ2d 1089, 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The combined teachings of these reference meet the broadly claimed limitations what the invention accomplishes. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 26 and 27 recite the limitations, “The computer program product” “the process”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 6-13, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Treyz in view of “Official Notice”.

6. As per claims 6 and 9, Treyz teaches the following:

a computer program product readable by a computer and encoding instructions for executing a computer process for notifying a user of a small computer device of notification events (e.g., a handheld computing device notifications, figure 69), the process comprising,

a computer system for notifying a user of notification events (e.g., a handheld computing device notifications, figure 69), the system comprising:

storing two or more profiles (e.g., each message type (fig. 69) denotes different profiles that a user can adjust to receive notification of events, i.e., proximity, local, notifications, etc, col., 35, line 53 – col., 36, line 10, col., 44, lines 20-65), of notification events for a user (e.g., multiple accounts of a user supported by handheld computing device, col., 26, lines 29-33) in the memory of the small computer device wherein the notification events are associated with at least one notification type and notifying a user of an event according to the stored profile (e.g., multiple users may be supported by handheld computing device, col., 26, lines 29-33, hence, each user may access a different shopping list and set different notification settings. As disclosed in figure 69 each user after loggin (each of his/her accounts) on selects and applies a particular notification mode inorder to receive a notification of an event. Each message type (fig. 69) denotes different profiles that a user can adjust to receive notification of events, i.e., proximity, local, notifications, etc, col., 35, line 53 – col., 36, line 10, col., 44, lines 20-65),

at least one profile of notification events (e.g., the user can select message types, like, proximity, local, notifications, reminders, e-mail, etc. The message types are different types of events. The alert response for each message type, like, vibration, visual only, tone, etc are the different types of notifications, which user can select for each event figure 69 and 70, col. 35 – col. 36, line 10, col. 44, lines 20 – 65), wherein the notification events are associated with at least one notification type (e.g., the user can select message types, like, proximity, local, notifications, reminders, e-mail, etc. The message types are different types of events. The alert response for each message type,

like, vibration, visual only, tone, etc are the different types of notifications, which user can select for each event figure 69 and 70, col. 35, line 53 – col. 36, line 10, col. 44, lines 20 – 65),

associating profile with a unique notification mode (e.g., the relationship between the message types (notification event) and the alert response (notification type) for each message type, like, vibration, visual only, tone, etc., figure 69 and 70, col. 35, line 53 – col. 36, line 10, col. 44, lines 20 – 65),

receiving a selection signal to select one notification mode (e.g., graphical user interface prompts to the user, col. 35, line 53 – col. 36, line 10, col. 44, lines 20 – 65),

applying the selected notification mode to the small computer device wherein the device remains in the selected notification mode until another notification mode is selected and wherein the user is notified of events in accordance with the profile associated with the selected notification mode, notifying a user of an event according to the stored profile (e.g., user can store his personnel settings (hence notification mode saved until personnel settings are altered for another selection for the notification type) for the messages events with the notification types and to select the events versus notification types, which can be saved locally or at a remote server and which user can modify whenever he desires to do so, figure 69 and 70, col. 35, line 53 – col. 36, line 10, col. 44, lines 20 – 65),

a memory unit for storing a plurality of profiles for a user (e.g., storage for multiple profiles and support for multiple users, multiple accounts available to each user, figure 4, col., 35, line 53 – col., 36, line 10, col., 44, lines 20-65), the profile relating notification events with notification types (e.g., user can store his personnel settings for

the messages events with the notification types and to select the events versus notification types, which can be saved locally or at a remote server and which user can modify whenever he desires to do so, figure 69 and 70, col. 35, line 53 – col. 36, line 10, col. 44, lines 20 – 65),

a first output device for notifying the user of a notification event using a first notification type (e.g., speaker to provide audible alert to the user, col. 35, lines 53-64),

a second output device for notifying the user of the notification event using a second notification type wherein the second notification type is different from the first notification type (e.g., vibration unit 116 may be used to vibrate handheld computing unit when it is desired to alert the user by vibrations without disturbing people in the vicinity of handheld computing unit by not using an audible alert, col. 15, line 64 – col.16, line 15);

a processing unit in response to a profile selected from the plurality of profiles in the memory unit automatically determining whether to notify the user using the first notification type or the second notification type (processor, figure 4, audio tones or vibration unit, col. 15, line 64 – col.16, line 15).

However, Treyz do not specifically mention about notification profiles and each notification profile (note: without “said” or “the” not necessarily the same profile mentioned earlier) is associated with a predetermined notification mode and wherein within each notification profile (note: without “said” or “the” not necessarily the same profile mentioned earlier) are notification events and each of the notification events is associated with a notification type.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing notification profiles and each notification profile is associated with a predetermined notification mode and wherein within each notification profile are notification events and each of the notification events is associated with a notification type(s) is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include notification profiles and each notification profile is associated with a predetermined notification mode and wherein within each notification profile are notification events and each of the notification events is associated with a notification type(s) with the teachings of Treyz in order to facilitate usage of the notification profile and predetermined notification mode because the notification profile would support retaining information related to a user specific information. Having multiple notification profiles would support retaining specific information for multiple users respectively. The predetermined notification mode would provide help specify which type of the notification mode the profile is related to. The notification events that are related to notification type(s) would provide information on what notification type(s) is used for the notification events of the profile.

7. As per claims 7, 8, 10-13, Treyz and “Official Notice” disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Treyz also teaches the following:

a calendar-type application program storing reminder events and wherein the selection signal is generated by the calendar-type application program, the notification event is a calendar event stored by a calendar-type application program (e.g., calendar of

events at a bookstore, if the user is interested in the event, the user may select set reminder option, col. 35, lines 53-64),

the notification event is the reception of email over a wireless network, (e.g., the handheld computing device may also be used for communications functions such as sending and receiving e-mail. Wireless communications may involve short-range or local wireless links and may also involve longer-range or remote wireless links (col. 2, lines 11-15),

applying the selected notification mode to the small computer device and wherein the device remains in the selected mode until another mode is selected and wherein the user is notified of events according to the selected notification mode (e.g., the user can select and set notification events. The user settings are retained using the handheld device for each user. The user is also allowed to select and set notification types for the notification events. Also the user is allowed to select or modify or retain the notification type for each notification event, in the manner the user desires to do so (e.g., figure 69 and 70, col. 35, line 53 – col. 36, line 10, col. 44, lines 20 – 65),

associating profile with a unique notification mode (e.g., the user can select and set notification events. The user settings are retained using the handheld device for each user. The user is also allowed to select and set notification types for the notification events. Also the user is allowed to select or modify or retain the notification type for each notification event, in the manner the user desires to do so (e.g., figure 69 and 70, col. 35, line 53 – col. 36, line 10, col. 44, lines 20 – 65),

receiving a selection signal to select one notification mode (e.g., graphical user interface provided by the handheld device to the user for notification mode selections, col. 35, lines 53-64),

the first notification type is an audible signal and the second notification type is a visual display, the first notification type is a vibration signal and the second notification type is an audible signal (e.g., audio tones or vibration unit etc. with different output notification types, col. 15, line 64 – col.16, line 15).

8. As per claims 26 and 27, Treyz does not specifically mention about the further claimed limitations of claims 26 and 27.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing selecting a particular notification mode (note: not related to the notification mode claimed earlier in the claim) to modify a notification profile (note: not related to the notification profile claimed earlier in the claim) for that mode, storing the modified profile, selecting volume levels for different notification types (note: not related to the notification type claimed earlier in the claim) associated with notification events (note: not related to the notification events claimed earlier in the claim) within a notification profile (note: not related to the notification profile claimed earlier in the claim) is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include selecting a particular notification mode to modify a notification profile for that mode, storing the modified profile, selecting volume levels for different notification types associated with notification events within a notification profile

with the teachings of Treyz in order to facilitate usage of selecting the particular notification mode, storing the modified profile, selecting volume levels because the profile would support retaining information related to a user specific information. Having multiple notification profiles would support retaining specific information for multiple users respectively. The particular notification mode would provide help specify which type of the notification mode the profile is related to. The modified profile with modified information would be available for future use. The selection of volume levels would help specify the volume levels for the notification types. The notification events that are related to notification type(s) would provide information on what notification type(s) is used for the notification events of the profile.

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Treyz and “Official Notice” in view of Wies et. al, 6,125,385 (Hereafter Wies).

10. As per claim 14, Treyz and “Official Notice” disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Treyz also teaches the concept of accessing the settings that are stored in the profile, for example, to assign/select a tone for a notification event (e.g., figure 69, col., 35, line 53 – col., 36, line 10, col., 44, lines 20-65).

However, Treyz does not specifically mention about assignment of a particular sound file to a particular event.

Wies discloses assignment of a particular sound file to a particular event (e.g., col., 7, lines 2-3, col., 32, line 48 – col., 33, line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Treyz and “Official Notice” with the

teachings of Wies in order to facilitate assigning a particular sound file to a particular event because a sound file would be used to help provide an audio alert assigned to an event. A profile containing information related to a user including sound file selection will help the user to select different sound files for different events. The selection of a sound file for an event would help store the sound file for a user.

11. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Treyz and “Official Notice” in view of Zimmers et al., 6,816,878 (Hereinafter Zimmers).

12. As per claim 15, Treyz and “Official Notice” disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Treyz does not specifically mention about an event notification type based on a user's present environment.

Zimmers discloses the concept to module an event notification type based on a user's present environment (e.g., col., 7, lines 5 - 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Treyz and the “Official Notice” with the teachings of Zimmers in order to facilitate an event notification type based on a user's present environment because the notification type and the environment would help provide different notifications based on the event type. The user's present environment would help provide notification for the user. The notification with type would help the user to know about the notification event.

13. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Treyz, “Official Notice” in view of Shetty et al., 5,808,907 (Hereinafer Shetty).

14. As per claims 16-18, Treyz and “Official Notice” disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Treyz does not specifically mention about a user is capable of being notified of an event in a plurality of ways, depending on a currently selected profile, each of a plurality of profiles contains the plurality of notifications for an event.

Shetty discloses the concept of a user notified of an event in a plurality of ways (e.g., col., 2, lines 38 - 61), depending on a currently selected profile (e.g., col., 2, lines 38 - 61), each of a plurality of profiles contains the plurality of notifications for an event (e.g., col., 2, lines 38 - 61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Treyz and “Official Notice” with the teachings of Shetty in order to facilitate a user notified of an event in a plurality of ways, depending on a currently selected profile, each of a plurality of profiles contains the plurality of notifications for an event because the event would help notify the user. The plurality of ways would help event provided to the user. The currently selected profile would help the software know which way the event needs to be provided to the user. Having a plurality of profiles would help the user to support multiple events. The plurality of notifications for an event would help the event notified to the user using different notifications.

Conclusion

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the

teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Haresh Patel

May 11, 2006